

Successfully Changing Individual Travel Behavior
Applying Community-Based Social Marketing to Travel Choice

Submitted August 1, 2006

Word Count: 6,745

Submitted by:

Carol Cooper, King County Metro Transit

400 Yesler Way

MS YES-TR-0600

Seattle, WA 98104

Phone: (206) 684-6766

Fax: (206) 684-2058

Email: carol.cooper@metrokc.gov

ABSTRACT

King County Metro Transit's In Motion program successfully demonstrates the effectiveness of community-based social marketing techniques in affecting people's transportation awareness and behavior. The In Motion approach focuses on neighborhood-based outreach, rather than the more typical employer-based trip reduction. In addition, In Motion addresses the potential to change any trip from drive alone to alternative mode, rather than focusing exclusively on commute trips. The In Motion program provides neighborhood residents with incentives to try driving less, raises individual awareness of alternate travel choices, and helps break the automatic reflex to drive for all trips. The program was designed to be easily adapted to other neighborhoods with minor modifications in message and materials.

The program has been completed in four neighborhoods to date, and participants in all neighborhoods report increased transit ridership and utilization of other non-SOV (single occupant vehicle) modes, such as carpooling, biking and walking. The pre- and post-participant reported mode shares for each In Motion program indicate a 24 to over 50% decrease in driving alone, and a 20 to almost 50% increase in transit usage. These self-reported numbers are supported by bus stop counts and analysis of overall transit ridership.

The In Motion program has demonstrated promising results in both urban and suburban neighborhoods and has been positively received by residents and businesses. King County Metro Transit plans to continue expanding the program to new geographic areas in King County, and is exploring innovative approaches to establishing partnerships and leveraging funding for expanded applications.

INTRODUCTION

King County, located on the Puget Sound in Washington State, is nearly twice as large as the average county in the United States, spanning 2,134 square miles with more than 1.8 million people. Major cities include Seattle and Bellevue, with numerous smaller suburban cities located throughout the county. King County provides regional services to all residents of the county, ranging from public health to legal support, as well as public transit. King County Metro Transit (KCM) operates approximately 1,300 transit coaches, which serve about 100 million riders every year. King County Metro Transit has one of the largest vanpool fleets in the country, with over 700 vans, and a well-integrated bicycle support program.

King County Metro Transit is a leader in innovative transportation demand management (TDM) programs, such as employer and institutional pass programs, guaranteed ride home and employee voucher programs. In 1991, Washington State passed the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Act. The CTR Act, reauthorized in the 2006 legislative session, requires major employers to reduce drive alone commuting by their employees, and provides a regulatory framework for measuring employer success. Since passage of the CTR Act, KCM has worked closely with employers to design products and programs to help them meet their CTR goals. Almost all of these efforts focus on working through employers to reach employees, and in providing tools and incentives to employees to try commuting without driving alone.

While reducing drive-alone commute trips helps ease peak periods of congestion, overall travel continues to increase. A recent King County study indicates that over 75% of all trips are not-work related (1). In addition, KCM experiences excess capacity on many bus routes during midday, evening and weekend periods. King County Metro Transit developed the In Motion program to build demand for off-peak transit services and expand the use of non-drive alone travel options for all trips. Without any regulatory requirement for behavior change, KCM had to look for other sources of motivation to engage individuals in a discussion about their travel choices.

Affecting Behavior Change

In Motion utilizes the community-based social marketing approach described by McKenzie-Mohr in *Fostering Sustainable Behavior Change* (2). The IndiMark® program developed by Werner Brög and Socialdata (3) also provided a source of inspiration and guidance during program development. A brief overview of each of these approaches is provided below.

Community-Based Social Marketing (CBSM)

Community-based social marketing draws from social psychology and social marketing and emerged from a growing understanding that conventional social marketing can be effective in creating public awareness, yet has limitations in fostering individual behavior change. The CBSM approach involves identifying specific perceived barriers and benefits of carrying out a sustainable behavior, designing a strategy that utilizes behavior change tools, piloting the strategy, and lastly, evaluating the program's impact.

Program designers build the program around knowledge about what attracts and motivates individuals to engage in a particular sustainable behavior. Shifts to the desired behavior are encouraged through education, community involvement, increasing benefits or decreasing barriers of the sustainable behavior, increasing barriers or decreasing benefits of the unsustainable behavior, or changing perceptions of the benefits and barriers of the behavior. The behavior change tools consist of commitment, prompts, norms, communication, and incentives

(see Table 1). Community-based social marketing has been used effectively in increasing socially desirable behaviors in the environmental, public health, and transportation fields (4).

IndiMark®

The IndiMark® approach focuses specifically on transportation behavior change and follows a highly prescribed process, including the use of specific dialogs to encourage participation and provide motivation. Key components of the IndiMark® approach include identifying those individuals interested in changing travel behavior, and then providing them the specific support (information, personalized assistance) they need to overcome their perceived barriers to trying a different travel option. Individuals are encouraged to think about all their trips, and find those that are easy to change. The IndiMark® approach emphasizes the importance of distributing only the information a person is seeking and providing it directly to the individual with explanation about how to use the new information. Personal contact is the primary communication process which further supports people on an individual basis, motivating them to think more effectively about their travel choices (3).

THE IN MOTION PROGRAM

Defining the Program

King County Metro Transit engaged the services of Taylor/Consulting to develop a residential-based program that utilized the CBSM approach to change individual travel behavior from drive-alone to alternative modes. Key elements from the IndiMark® program, primarily customizing the response and providing a mechanism for ongoing communication, were included. The specific project goals are identified below:

Goal 1: Test KCM's Ability to Affect Travel Behavior by Engaging at the Neighborhood Level

Most travel decisions are made at the home end. Many trips are made by individuals that do not work, or do not work for an employer that provides any transportation support for commute travel. Consequently, even though KCM has effective programs and procedures in place to assist large employers affected by the state CTR Act, the majority of the population in King County is not being directly reached with travel option support. An effective and efficient method for engaging residents in considering their travel behavior at the home-end would greatly enhance the range of potential trips that can be affected and converted from drive-alone to alternative mode.

Goal 2: Test Ability to Nest the Program in the Local Community

Individuals today are increasingly bombarded with messages from all directions: an average of 3,000 advertisements per day (5). A major concern in developing a new home-based outreach program was the ability to break through the clutter of communication reaching an individual on any given day. Grounding the program in the local community was seen as a major benefit in securing the attention of our intended targets, as well as increasing acceptability of the message. In addition, it was hoped that local ownership would enhance the sustainability of the program and affected behavior changes.

Goal 3: Develop a Model that Can be Successfully Replicated in Other Neighborhoods

Traditional transit and trip reduction campaigns often employ a “once and done” approach. Catchy slogans are developed, print materials and other collateral produced, outreach activities occur and then – boxes of unused materials sit in store rooms and a new effort begins. The intent was to build an identity and approach for communicating with individuals about travel options that could extend from one neighborhood to the next. Designing a customizable, community-based approach would ensure that cost-effectiveness and ease of implementation of the program would increase over time.

Identifying Target Communities

Much energy and money is being expended on designing improvements to major transportation facilities throughout the Puget Sound region. In the meantime, many of the existing facilities, from sidewalks to bike lanes to buses, are currently underused. Consequently, communities with underutilized but adequate transportation and land use infrastructure were prime targets for the In Motion program. Such communities were defined by the following criteria:

- a residential density of over six dwelling units per acre
- availability of transit services with 30-minute midday frequency of better
- excess capacity on most transit routes
- access to local services within ¼ of a mile from the center of the residential area
- an established sense of neighborhood identity

An attempt was made to define areas that encompassed a broad spectrum of the population, in order to avoid skewing the results. Factors considered in making final neighborhood determinations included mix of housing type, household characteristics, ethnic diversity, income levels, auto ownership statistics, and single occupancy vehicle mode share to work. These factors were obtained from available US Census data. Topography and existing sidewalk network were also reviewed to determine the relative ease of biking and walking. Final boundaries were adjusted to define a project area of approximately 3,000 households which was supportable from a budget and workload standpoint.

The In Motion target communities have varied from high density, urban environments to lower density suburban communities. Madison-Miller, the first In Motion neighborhood, was a high-density urban environment well served by public transit with relatively high transit ridership. This community did not have a central business district, but did have retail establishments along an adjacent corridor. Columbia City, the site of the second project, is a multi-lingual community in south Seattle with a single family urban profile and a growing central business district. Lake Forest Park is an incorporated suburban city located fifteen miles north of downtown Seattle, characterized by lower residential density, more curvilinear streets and a local mall located in the southwest quadrant of the city. The most recent program to conclude was Crossroads, located in the rapidly urbanizing city of Bellevue. Crossroads is a mixed-density suburban neighborhood served by a central shopping mall.

Developing the Message and Approach

A key element of the community-based approach utilized by In Motion is crafting a message that speaks to the specific motivations and barriers of a particular community, and delivering that message in a way that is acceptable to the community. King County Metro Transit conducted a series of community and business leader interviews and neighborhood discussion groups at the initial stage of most projects. (No discussion groups were held for the Crossroads project.) Specific goals of these discussions were to:

- confirm the community identity,
- understand interests and values that might affect perceptions in the specific community,
- identify specific motivations, barriers and benefits to using alternative modes of transportation,
- solicit partners for program implementation,
- identify potential roles for the local business community and other organizations, and
- identify the best communication channels to reach members of the community.

Information obtained during these discussions provided the basis for developing the program elements and the specific messages. Commonalities were found among the communities, though order of importance varied between neighborhoods. Key motivators and barriers are listed in Table 2. The project team was somewhat surprised to find that traffic congestion and cost savings were not high on the list of motivations. In all cases, the single biggest motivator was personal health benefits, and this became a key component of our messaging.

Implementing In Motion

In order to provide a clear program overview, the description of program implementation will focus on the first project, Madison-Miller In Motion, in detail. Subsequent projects have been modeled the Madison-Miller prototype, with additions or changes based on neighborhood characteristics or program experiences. All programs incorporated the core program elements:

- Pledge component where participants can commit to reducing their drive alone travel during the project time period (average twelve weeks)
- Community presence in the form of pole posters, posters at businesses, and/or yard signs
- Mailing with targeted messaging to households within the neighborhood
- Website with resources, project success tracking, and ability to pledge online
- Customized information delivery to participants
- Partnerships with business or non-profits at some level
- Short travel questionnaire at beginning and end of project

Partner Recruitment – Building the Community

Developing a community-based approach required building partnerships with local organizations and businesses. In some cases, this allowed the program message to be delivered by sources the recipients knew, such as a community organization. In other cases, it demonstrated that local businesses saw value in the program and that other community members thought changing travel behavior was important. In all cases, it made In Motion part of the local community, rather than a more abstract, county-wide initiative that was easier to ignore.

Specific partner initiatives included:

- Inviting local merchants to be sponsors of the program. In return for posting program information and donating incentive prizes, they would receive publicity, public recognition and, hopefully, additional customers.
- Inviting community organizations and local schools to participate. Students of the local middle school worked with the project team to map walking distances, and other students created artwork around various travel modes for use in program materials. The

local community group distributed several email notifications on the program, and provided a program link from its website.

- Utilizing communication networks of other non-profit transportation organizations to recruit volunteers and project assistants (the Transportation Action Team), and participation in community events.

In order to increase the local community aspect of the program, a local implementation mechanism was put in place. For Madison-Miller it was a Transportation Action Team (TAT) comprised of several individuals living near or in the project area. The TAT carried out many local tasks, such as fulfillment of requested information, sending out earned incentives, hanging pole posters, delivering requested yard signs, and staffing events. In subsequent communities, KCM provided a small stipend to a local non-profit organization (such as the Rainier Chamber of Commerce in Columbia City and Hopelink in Crossroads) to carry out these tasks. These organizations have the administrative skills for on-the-ground program implementation, put a local face on day-to-day communications, and may be able to partner in on-going or future programs.

Program Branding

The overall program identity had to meet three prime criteria. It needed to clearly relate to transportation, be customizable for each neighborhood and be flexible enough to serve as an umbrella for a variety of other messages. The final In Motion logo (see Figure 1) provides a clear connection to travel options, reinforces the program name by giving a sense of movement, and can be used with or without a neighborhood name, which allowed for more cost-effective printing of some “generic” project materials which were used in multiple neighborhoods.

Key tag lines, building from the key motivators and barriers, were developed for use with the main program identity in different applications. Examples include:

- If you’re not going far, forget your car
- I can do more.....by driving less
- Improving our community through healthier travel choices
- It’s a community thing (relating to sponsors of the program)

A series of “prompts” were developed for display around the community on “pole posters.” The prompts suggested ways to leave the car behind and reflected all travel modes as well as ethnic and gender diversity. Sample prompts included “Hop on the bus, Russ!”, “Pedal to the gym, Kim!”, or Cycle on, Juan!”. Slogans are revised for each neighborhood to reflect local ethnicity and destinations.

Program Launch and Implementation

Madison-Miller In Motion ran for 10-weeks and subsequent programs have lasted between 10 and 14 weeks. The process for program launch and implementation generally includes four main steps: launch, direct communication, fulfillment and encouragement, wrap up and evaluation.

Step 1 – Program Launch In order to increase the effectiveness of the direct communication effort in Step 2, an attempt was made to create interest around the program identity before the direct mail was sent. This effort was very successful, and resulted in almost immediate website activity. Initial launch efforts, implemented up to two weeks before the direct mail, are listed below.

- Installing approximately 200 “pole posters” throughout the neighborhood with catchy slogans (see above) and basic program contact information
- Displaying program posters and bike/walk maps at local business sponsors
- Installing specific bus route maps at bus stops in the program area (Bus stop maps were not used in either Columbia City or Lake Forest Park.)
- Distributing “random rewards” by TAT members wearing program t-shirts to individuals who were using alternatives to driving alone (This element was not repeated due to limited effectiveness.)
- Posting program website with information, photos, and an opportunity to enroll in “Club Motion” and be rewarded for healthier travel choices (www.metrokc.gov/inmotion)
- Establishing a telephone hotline for people without internet access

Step 2 - Direct Communication Feedback received during the initial discussion groups and interviews indicated that individuals preferred to be contacted by direct mail. Due to the quantity of direct mail received by most individuals, a concerted effort was made to tie the direct mail to the prompts placed throughout the neighborhood. The direct mail included a program brochure, a local bus/bike/walk map, and a note pad to serve as an ongoing in-home prompt. Individuals requesting any of the specific information listed on the reply card received ten KCM Free Ride Tickets. Additional incentives were available for anyone pledging to change two trips per week from drive alone to another mode over the course of the project. This required ongoing trip reporting and communications as rewards were distributed over the ten-week period. Participants could sign-up and report their changed travel behavior through postal mail or online. An additional incentive, a program t-shirt, was available to the first 50 respondents.

Step 3 – Fulfillment and Encouragement Similar to the IndiMark® approach, In Motion allowed individuals to ask for specific information about various travel modes and then provided them only the information they requested in a timely manner. Information was offered on all modes of travel. The information was delivered via the postal service, rather than personal delivery as in IndiMark®. At the same time as requesting information, or at a later date, individuals could commit to changing their travel behavior – a key component of the CBSM approach. The commitment – to change two trips per week from drive alone to another mode – required them to report the changed behavior over a period of weeks for which additional incentives would be earned. In Madison-Miller, an individual could earn a \$5 voucher for every week that they reported successfully changing two drive-alone trips to an alternate mode. The vouchers could be used to purchase transit passes, biking and walking gear, or gasoline for carpooling. Individuals could also volunteer to put a “Count Me In” sign in their yard which served to normalize the program among neighbors, and as a reminder to think about travel choices.

Program participants were encouraged to contact program staff via the website and telephone hotline if they needed additional information or assistance regarding a travel option or completion of travel logs. Assistance was provided by TAT members, with back-up by County staff. The TAT also staffed a table at the YMCA Healthy Kids day event and hosted a community “Spring Into Motion” event to highlight the program. A community WOW board, posted on the website, reported periodically on program results.

Local businesses donated a variety of goods and services in support of the program. These were distributed throughout the project through random drawings, to provide additional incentive to continue reporting travel behavior changes.

Step 4 - Wrap Up and Evaluation At the completion of each program, all participants were asked to complete a simple survey regarding their travel behavior and the usefulness of the program. Results of this survey were compared with initial data collected on mode choice, and used to calculate change. In addition, the project team held a guided discussion with a group of survey respondents to further assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Key findings from the discussion group feedback included:

- The pledging component was critical in follow through on changing behavior. It was the primary motivator in choosing not to drive at the decision moment.
- People needed more ongoing feedback that their trip logs were being received, and would like to see what was being achieved by them and their community on a more immediate basis.
- Even individuals who were already using non-drive alone modes often found they could leave their car behind more often.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The In Motion program has been evaluated using a variety of methods, all of which indicate the program is successful at engaging interested individuals in thinking about their travel choices and in changing some of their drive alone travel. Madison-Miller In Motion, the initial demonstration program, was evaluated more extensively than subsequent projects. Methods included a community-wide controlled, random sample telephone survey before and after the program period. The survey contained sections on local travel behavior, perceived barriers to use of alternative modes, openness to change, and awareness of the program (project penetration). A controlled, two-wave bus-stop count survey also was conducted. The survey and bus stop counts were conducted in a control neighborhood at the same time as the Madison-Miller area. (The control neighborhood survey did not contain a section on program awareness). In addition, the survey of program participants described above provided information on participant mode share and perceptions of the program.

Community-wide Telephone Survey

It was desirable to measure the ability of the In Motion program to “cut through the clutter” with which individuals are confronted on a daily basis. Key to program participation is awareness that a program exists. One-third (33%) of all survey respondents in the project area were aware that there was a “Madison-Miller In Motion” program (6). The pole posters and special route maps at bus stops had the highest recall; 56% of respondents indicated they remembered seeing them in the neighborhood. One-quarter (25%) of survey respondents recalled receiving the direct mail packet, with almost half of those (48%) reporting they responded to the mailer. This corresponds well with the mailer response rate of 10.5% recorded for the program (see Table 3). The high level of program awareness throughout the community indicates that In Motion was successful in capturing the attention of individuals in the target area and in engaging them in consideration of their travel options.

The telephone survey also was designed to measure the effect of the In Motion program on individual perceptions of alternative transportation modes and willingness to use them. It is

recognized in social sciences that there is a continuum of behavior change. These are described in a concept known as the Transtheoretical Model, first developed in the field of public health (7). The stages of behavior change are:

- Stage 1 – Precontemplation: an individual has no interest in, or intention to, change behavior
- Stage 2 – Contemplation: an individual is aware that a problem exists and is thinking about making a change but has not made any commitment to action
- Stage 3 – Preparation: an individual is committing to making a change in a near time frame
- Stage 4: Action: an individual makes modifications needed to overcome the problem
- Stage 5: Maintenance: an individual is solidifying changes and working to prevent relapses

Changing an ingrained travel behavior, such as grabbing your car keys and driving to your destination, can require an individual to move along the continuum of behavior change over the course of months or years. The project team recognized that the In Motion program may successfully provide the impetus for some individuals in the final stages of the behavior change continuum to change the way they travel (move from Stage 3 to Stage 4). It was viewed equally important, however, to reach individuals further down the continuum (Stages 1 and 2), and move them closer to a state of readiness to change their travel behavior.

In order to measure program impact on the stages of change, the telephone survey included two series of statements designed to identify where people were on the continuum related to transportation mode choices. One series was transit-specific and the other involved broader range of attitudes about local travel.

The probability that a substantial number of project participants would be included as part of the community-wide random telephone survey was low, due to the limited number (212) of participants. Consequently, the project team did not expect statistically significant community-wide changes in travel behavior during the short time span of this project. However, there were significant community-wide changes in attitudes. This indicates that the process of contacting all households, coupled with the community-wide prompts, had an effect beyond the universe of program participants.

Key significant findings for respondents to the telephone survey are summarized below. All findings reported were significant at the 95% confidence level. Comparable changes did not occur in the control neighborhood (6).

Utility of Alternative Transportation Modes

- Respondents agreed they could bus, bike, or walk for more trips than they currently do (69% compared to 50% before the program). This shift was even greater for respondents that indicated they were open to changing their travel behavior (Stages 2 through 4), with over 80% agreeing they could use alternatives more than they do, compared to 58% before the program.
- Those aware of the program found they could use transportation alternatives most of the time (50% compared to 30% of those not aware).
- Program area residents showed an increased interest in taking a bus to special events, such as ball games or festivals (51% after compared to 28% before).
- Those aware of the program indicated they used public transit for some trips, and could probably use it to get to more places (55% compared to 28% not aware).

- Those aware of the program who work outside the home walk an average of 13 blocks to work, compared to 5 blocks for those not aware of the program.

Perceptions Regarding Barriers to Using Alternative Transportation Modes

- Program area residents' perception regarding public transit improved, with fewer respondents agreeing that public transit took too long or was not pleasant to ride (18% after compared to 25% before).
- Sixty-six percent (66%) of those aware of the program reported that hills were not a barrier to use of alternatives, compared to 26% of those not aware of the program.
- For those aware of the program, more respondents indicated that personal safety concerns were not a barrier for walking than for those not aware of the program (95% compared to 81% for those not aware).
- Those aware of the program were less likely to view lack of local stores as a major barrier to a non-drive alone option (2% compared to 11% for those not aware).

Perceptions Regarding Benefits of Using Alternative Transportation Modes

Those aware of the Madison-Miller In Motion program were more likely than those not aware of the program to agree to the following statements:

- Driving children to their activities was bad for childrens' health (95% compared to 20%).
- Walking and taking the bus is a good way to connect with their neighborhood (82% compared to 61%).
- Traffic and parking in their neighborhood would improve if they and their neighbors drove less to local businesses (98% compared to 79%).

Bus Stop Counts

Bus stop boardings were counted at representative bus zones within both the Madison-Miller project area and a control area. Counts were made at the same stops for two weeks in November 2003 and the same two week period in November 2004. The program ran from May through August 2004. Analysis of the counts indicated a 9% increase in boardings at bus stops in the project area, compared with a 1% decrease in boardings at bus stops in the control area (8). During this same period, overall system ridership increased by approximately 2.5%.

A similar result was found in the Crossroads neighborhood, where ridership trends were tracked using Automated Passenger Count (APC) data. The Crossroads project, located in the East sub-area of King County, was implemented September through mid-November 2005. A comparison of Fall 2005 (September through January) ridership to Fall 2004 ridership at both the project and sub-area level supports the impression that participation in the In Motion program increases transit use. Based on analysis of bus stop level APC data during this period, boardings at bus stops in the Crossroads area increased 24% on average, compared to a 14% increase for the East sub-area (9).

Program Tracking and Participant Surveys

All programs track participation rates by individuals and business sponsors, as well as reported mode shifts. Each program also tracked participation numbers based on those who made a pledge or requested information. Percent mode change of those that pledged was determined through comparison of pre- and post-participant reported mode shares. A majority of the

programs also tracked the number of changed trips reported by the participants through trip logs (trip logs were not utilized in the Crossroads project). Those who pledged to reduce drive-alone trips submitted trip logs in which they described where they went, how they traveled, and trip distance.

A summary of key indicators for each program is shown in Table 3. Response rates for each program ranged from 6% to 10% of the number of households receiving the direct mailing. Of those responding, the pledge rate averaged over 75%. Overall, participants reported reducing drive-alone trips by 24% to 50% and even higher percentage increases in busing, biking, walking and carpooling.

In addition, local support has been strong - from businesses and individuals alike. An average of 90% rated the campaigns positively, with 25% rating the program as “very successful” (10). Across programs, local businesses strongly supported In Motion due to the potential benefit from increased local activity. Not only might local patronage increase, but if local patrons travel to stores by non-drive alone modes, more parking could be available for other customers.

The pre- and post-participant reported mode shares for each In Motion program indicate a shift in mode split from drive alone to a mix of other modes (see Table 3). On average, 20% of those who pledged to reduce drive-alone travel reported that they were able to achieve a “significant” reduction in solo driving, with 48% reporting they were able to reduce drive alone travel “somewhat”. Less than 10% reported they were unable to achieve any reduction in their drive alone travel (10).

The greatest reported motivator for considering participation in the program was the King County Metro Transit Free Ride Tickets, followed closely by the goal of personal health benefits. Information about transportation alternatives was ranked either “very” or “somewhat” helpful by nearly 80% of the respondents, and the overall effectiveness of the program in raising awareness was rated successful or very successful by over 90% (10).

Program Costs

The cost of the In Motion program has decreased with each program implementation (see Table 3). Costs shown for Madison-Miller include all initial program definition and development costs, and are consequently skewed to the high end. Many variables affect the cost of subsequent programs, most notably the number of residential units included in the project area and the range of specific collateral pieces produced. Each program has utilized the same overall program approach and has built from collateral pieces and implementation processes defined in the initial program. The project has been successful in achieving it’s goal of replication in a cost-effective manner.

CONCLUSION

The In Motion program model is a valuable tool to educate individuals about their travel choices and to motivate them to try new ways of traveling. It has proven to be an effective and replicable program that can be utilized in many types of communities. The effectiveness of the program will be greater in areas that have a supporting infrastructure of walkable street networks, mix of land uses, and frequent transit service, yet will work in less urban areas, as exemplified in the Lake Forest Park In Motion project. Program participants consistently reported that people who pledged to reduce their single occupant vehicle trips did, indeed, by up to 50%, and they increased busing, walking, bicycling, and carpooling.

Creating fun and useable prompts (pole posters, tote bags, water bottles, and note pads) and norms (yard signs, WOW reporting board) does seem to increase visibility of the program and underscore the sense of it being a community effort rather than some “government campaign.” Simplified route maps at bus stops is an effective element in encouraging transit ridership.

Giving residents tools and knowledge about alternative modes of transportation and creating a focus on sustainable and healthier communities appealed to residents. The involvement of local partners is crucial to help engender community acceptance for the project, assure efficient fulfillment and a local presence at events, and maintain communication with the participants. Business sponsors also are extremely valuable to the project by creating a local presence and high visibility for the In Motion message, helping promote the program message and goals, and donating prizes and other rewards for those participating in the In Motion program.

NEXT STEPS

King County Metro Transit continues to implement the In Motion approach in various neighborhoods throughout King County. Near term goals include expanding the program to engage employees that work within a program area in considering changes to both work and non-work trips, and in strengthening the partnership aspect of program implementation.

There has been a great amount of effort to determine new ways to prompt individuals to join and commit to the program as well as provide more efficient feedback mechanisms. A new website was established for the most recent In Motion program, being conducted in the Ballard community in the summer of 2006. A new automated database simplifies users’ ability to report and track their travel behavior and helps the implementation partners with fulfillment activities. Evaluation for the Ballard program will be structured to allow a second post-program survey to assess the impact of In Motion on sustained behavior change.

King County Metro Transit is completing a pilot implementation of the IndiMark® program, working with Socialdata. A comparative evaluation between the In Motion program and the IndiMark project will be conducted to help determine the most effective course for future actions.

REFERENCES

- (1) Frank, Lawrence. *Travel Behavior, Environmental, & Health Impacts of Community Design & Transportation Investment. A Study of Land Use, Transportation, Air Quality and Health in King County, WA*. In Collaboration with Dr. James Sallis, San Diego State University, Dr. Brian Saelens, University of Cincinnati, Dr. William Bachman, GeoStats, Inc., Mr. Kevin Washbrook, Vancouver, B.C. Seattle, WA, December 2005.
- (2) McKenzie-Mohr, D and William Smith. *Fostering Sustainable Behavior: An Introduction to Community-Based Social Marketing*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, B.C., Canada, 1999.
- (3) Brög, Werner, Erhard Erl, and Helen Grey-Smith. *The Perth Experience: Reducing the Use of Cars - the Homeopathic Way*. Paper presented at a Seminar of the London Assembly “Reducing Traffic Congestion in London: Policy Options other than Road Pricing. January 2002.
- (4) Tools of Change Homepage. Cullbridge Marketing and Communications, Ontario, Canada. <http://www.toolsofchange.com/English/firstsplit.asp>. Accessed numerous times, 2003, 2004, 2005.
- (5) Media Awareness Network Website. Media Awareness Network, Ontario, Canada. http://www.media-awareness.ca/english/parents/marketing/advertising_everywhere.cfm. Accessed July 27, 2006.
- (6) Thorpe, Janet. *King County Metro Community TDM Evaluation Survey – Phase Two Report*. Northwest Research Group, Bellevue, WA, August 2004.
- (7) Transtheoretical Model Website. Cancer Prevention Research Center. <http://www.uri.edu/research/cprc/TTM/detailedoverview.htm>, Accessed February 2004.
- (8) Northwest Research Group. Two Wave Controlled Bus Stop Count Survey. King County, November 2004.
- (9) King County Metro and Taylor/Consulting. *Crossroads In Motion: Wrap-Up Report*. Seattle, WA, May 2006.
- (10) Taylor/Consulting Team. In *Motion Neighborhood TDM Pilots, Final Report*. Taylor/Consulting Team, Seattle, WA 2004.

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1 Community Based Social Marketing Tools

Table 2 Primary Motivators and Barriers to Using Alternative Transportation

Table 3 Project Characteristics and Results

Figure 1 In Motion Logo

TABLE 1 Community Based Social Marketing Tools

Tool	Effect	In Motion Example
Commitment	Commitment causes attitude shift, more consistent action	Check box to pledge to change two trips per week to non-drive alone
	Written more effective than oral	Join Club Motion
Prompts	Visual or auditory reminders to carry out the behavior	In-home note pads
		Walk/bike maps
	Should be present close in space and time to target behavior	Pole posters
		Water bottles, safety lights
Norms	Guide behavior as person looks to others for clues	"Count Me In" yard signs
	Explicit and noticeable	Business sponsor window slicks
		T-shirts, water bottles
Communication	Persuade, educate and communicate desired behavior	Direct mail brochure
		Website
	Frame message to diffuse new attitudes	"Improving our community through healthy travel choices"
	Vivid, personal, concrete	
Incentives	Integrate personal, community goals	"You can do more"
	Motivate person to implement desired behavior	Free Ride Tickets
	Closely match incentive to desired behavior	Vouchers good for bus passes or non-bus alternative mode gear
		Local business coupons to encourage local travel

Table 2 Primary Motivators and Barriers to Using Alternative Transportation*

Motivators	Barriers
Personal health benefit	Personal Safety
Community connection	Hills/Topography
Avoiding parking hassle	Lack of services
Environmental concerns	Inconvenience

*Motivators and barriers are not listed in rank order, as it varied between communities.

Table 3: Project Characteristics and Results

	Madison-Miller	Lake Forest Park	Columbia City	Crossroads
Program Duration	(10 weeks, Spring)	(14 weeks, Summer)	(10 weeks, Fall)	(12 weeks, Fall)
Area Characteristics				
# Households	2,740	5,015	2,983	3,462
Urban, high density	X			
Urban, mixed density			X	X
Suburban		X		
Results				
Response Rate	10.47%	6.90%	9.92%	8.38%
Number of Respondents	287	346	296	290
Number Pledging	212	216	239	289
% Change in Reported Mode Share				
Decrease SOV	30%	24%	28%	58%
Increase Bus	22%	94%	29%	47%
Increase Bike	77%	153%	14%	-63%
Increase Walk	38%	49%	37%	33%
Increase Carpool	46%	52%	34%	9%
Trips Changed per Logs	770	720	493	NA ¹
% Free Ride Tickets Redeemed	59%	NA ²	71%	53%
Costs				
\$ per household	\$56.77	\$18.34	\$19.50	\$12.82
\$ per participant	\$542	\$426	\$196	\$153.03
VMT reduced ³	8,100	11,600	6,062	NA
\$ per VMT decreased	\$19	\$7.93	\$9.59	NA
Total cost (\$)	\$155,553	\$92,000	\$58,157	\$44,380
Program Elements				
Standard Pieces				
Pledge	X	X	X	X
Direct Mail	X	X	X	X
Incentives	X	X	X	X
Information Available	X	X	X	X
Trip Logs	X	X	X	
Pole Posters	X		X	
Yard Signs	X		X	
Community Map	X	X	X	X
Additional Pieces				
Prompts - Community	X		X	X
Business Sponsors ⁴	X (34)		X (37)	
Community Paper		X		
Local Partners	X	X	X	X
Community Outreach				
Events	X	X	X	X
Email Lists				
Multi-lingual flyers			X	X

NA¹ Trip logs were not required in the Crossroads project

NA² Unique Free Ride Tickets were not used in the Lake Forest Project, and consequently, redemption rates could not be calculated.

³Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction based on participant trip logs.

⁴ Number in parentheses indicates the number of local businesses who donated incentives and posted project information

FIGURE 1 In Motion Logo

